arXiv:1607.00882v2 [stat.ME] 22 Dec 2016

Modelling Ordinal Responses with Uncertainty: a Hierarchical Marginal Model with Latent Uncertainty components

Roberto Colombi[1], Sabrina Giordano[2], Anna Gottard[3], Maria Iannario[4]

[1] *Department of Management, Information and Production Engineering, University of Bergamo, Italy, e-mail: colombi@unibg.it*

[2] *Department of Economics, Statistics and Finance, University of Calabria, Italy, e-mail: sabrina.giordano@unical.it*

[3] *Department of Statistics, Computer Science, Applications, University of Florence, Italy, e-mail:gottard@disia.unifi.it*

[4] *Department of Political Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Italy, e-mail:maria.iannario@unina.it*

Abstract

This paper proposes a multivariate model for ordinal rating responses, allowing for uncertainty in answering. In responding to rating questions, an individual may give answers either according to his/her knowledge (*feeling*) or to his/her level of indecision (*uncertainty*), typically driven by a *response style*. Since ignoring this uncertainty may lead to misleading results, we define the joint distribution of the ordinal responses via a mixture of components, characterized by uncertainty in answering to a subset of variables. The effectiveness of the proposed model is attested through applications to real data and supported by a Monte Carlo study.

keywords: Ordinal data, Mixture models, Latent variables, Uncertainty, Marginal models

1 Introduction

Rating scales such as the Likert scale are widely used in many research fields. Respondents are invited to express their opinion about a set of items by choosing among ordinal categories. The observed values of rating questions can be either respondents' exact expression of their opinion or answers corresponding to a response style ensued from indecision or uncertainty. The first type of answers are of interest when one is focused on the *true* perceived value of the items, the second type are investigated mainly in psychological studies on the uncertainty in the process of response. Examples can be found, among many, in Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2001), Yates et al. (1997) and Luchini and Watson (2013). Therefore, it is crucial to adopt a model able to distinguish the two ways of answering, that, according

to the existing literature on the topic (see, for e.x. D'Elia and Piccolo, 2005; Tutz et al., 2016), we will call *feeling* (for the exact expression of personal opinion on an item) and *uncertainty* (for intrinsic indecision). Uncertainty is due to the difficulty of some respondents to determine their choice among the ordered alternatives and it can lead, if ignored, to misleading results. This aspect will be clarified in a simulation study in Section 6 where it is shown that the parameters of interest are underestimated or overestimated if uncertainty is ignored.

In a multivariate setting, it is also relevant to distinguish the dependence structure of responses dictated by the item knowledge from that dictated by a response style due to uncertainty. In this sense, our approach enables us to separate association from uncertainty and describe how concordant or discordant are the responses that aware people give to a set of questions. This cannot be learned from other approaches on ordinal data which do not take into account the uncertainty.

The model proposed in this paper makes possible, for each item, to determine the probability of an uncertain response and to describe its dependence on individual characteristics and on the uncertainty in other items. The joint distribution of the responses given by feeling is purged from the uncertainty component to get a correct evaluation of the marginal distributions, the association structure and the dependence on explanatory factors. The marginal feeling distributions can be described starting from a one parameter distribution as in D'Elia and Piccolo (2005) up to a general ordinal response model (Tutz et al., 2016) and the uncertainty distributions can vary from the simplest Uniform distribution to several alternatives which capture different response styles as in Gottard et al. (2016).

Specifically, we consider a marginal model (Bergsma and Rudas, 2002; Bartolucci et al., 2007) with latent binary variables that take into account the two possible behaviours in answering. In this way, the joint distribution of the ordinal variables is modelled by a mixture of components, each characterized by uncertainty in a subset of the responses and feeling in the rest. The parameterization of the joint distribution of the observed and latent variables through a marginal model greatly simplifies the inclusion of explanatory variables, the maximum likelihood estimation issues and the interpretation of the results.

The paper is organized as follows. We firstly present a motivating example (Sec. 2) to illustrate the usefulness of our model. Then, we introduce the model in the bivariate case (Sec. 3) to exemplify our proposal in a simple setting. We discuss the general case in Sections 4 and 5, describing the main assumptions (Sec. 4.1), the parameterization adopted (Sec. 4.2) and details on the maximum likelihood estimators (Sec. 5). The bias in the parameter estimates introduced by ignoring uncertainty in the answers is illustrated in Section 6 via a Monte Carlo study.

Applications to the data introduced in Section 2 and some concluding remarks are provided in Sections 7 and 8, respectively. Analytical technicalities are reported in two Appendices.

2 Motivating examples

In this section we introduce a case study useful, in our opinion, to motivate the model we are proposing and to illustrate its advantages with respect to standard models for ordinal data.

The example concerns the perception of the quality of working life and is based on data from the 5^{th} European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), carried out in 34 countries by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound). The survey provides an overview of working conditions of both employees and self employed across Europe. We focused on respondents' agreement on three statements which describe key facets of their job:

- *Losejob*: I might lose my job in the next 6 months,
- *Wellpaid*: I am well paid for the work I do,
- *Career*: My job offers good prospects for career advancement,

here recoded on a 3-point scale: *disagree*, *neither agree nor disagree*, *agree*, and their dependence on *Gender* (*Male*, *Female*) and *Country* (*Northern* and *Southern* regions of EU according to the geographic scheme in use by the United Nations which includes Cyprus and Turkey).

Table 1 reports the data of a sample of 3 500 workers derived from those available on the Eurofound website `https://www.eurofound.europa.eu`.

It is reasonable that not all the respondents have been able to allocate their perceptions exactly into a category when requested to evaluate personal satisfactions and worries on their work. Personal inclinations could have prevented people to adequately quantify their responses. Someone might have unwittingly skipped extreme values, optimists might have overvalued their feelings and pessimists might have underrated them.

The model proposed in this paper adequately takes into account for uncertainty in the responses of interest. Moreover, it allows to study if the possibility of losing the job is perceived with more/less uncertainty than the evaluation of own remuneration or the potential career opportunities. We can assess if there is independence or not in the propensity to answer with uncertainty to the ratings and how this propensity varies with respect of individual characteristics, such as, for example, gender and country. Through our proposal, we can also describe the association

Table 1: Observed joint distribution of EWCS data for *Losejob*, *Wellpaid* and *Career*, *Gender* and *Country*

Gender			Male			Female		
		Career	disagree	n. agree n. disagree	agree	disagree	n. agree n. disagree	agree
Country	*Losejob*	*Wellpaid*						
Northern regions of EU	disagree	disagree	136	41	26	179	62	34
		n. agree n. disagree	121	94	84	129	76	62
		agree	116	87	227	89	57	173
	n. agree n. disagree	disagree	45	10	7	30	14	6
		n. agree n. disagree	21	40	30	32	20	15
		agree	13	19	25	5	8	25
	agree	disagree	76	7	11	60	9	13
		n. agree n. disagree	36	21	4	13	9	6
		agree	18	9	12	10	10	18
Southern regions of EU	disagree	disagree	30	7	17	39	11	19
		n. agree n. disagree	33	31	26	24	20	22
		agree	49	64	137	41	36	97
	n. agree n. disagree	disagree	9	3	2	7	4	3
		n. agree n. disagree	11	10	4	5	3	2
		agree	6	14	22	8	8	12
	agree	disagree	15	1	6	18	2	5
		n. agree n. disagree	8	15	4	10	10	5
		agree	12	10	21	9	7	6

between the answers provided by the respondents who show awareness in all the responses, and the dependence of these answers on the respondent's features.

3 A mixture model for two responses

For clarity, it is useful to introduce the main features of our model in the simple case of two items and delay the general presentation to the next section.

Let R_1 and R_2 be two ordinal variables, with support $\{1, 2, \ldots, m_1\}$ and $\{1, 2, \ldots, m_2\}$, respectively. We assume the existence of two latent variables, U_l, $l = 1, 2$, such that the respondent answers the l^{th} question according to his/her feeling when $U_l = 1$ or his/her uncertainty when $U_l = 0$. Moreover, the ordinal variable R_l is supposed to depend only on the latent variable U_l, $l = 1, 2$. As a consequence,

A1. $R_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp U_2 \mid U_1$ and $R_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp U_1 \mid U_2$.

This implies that each latent variable affects only its specific item. Moreover, we assume that

A2. given $U_l = 0$, R_l has a Uniform distribution, $l = 1, 2$.

Under these assumptions, the marginal distribution of the ordinal variable R_l, where $l = 1, 2$, can be defined as

$$P(R_l = r_l) \;=\; \pi_l \, P(R_l = r_l \mid U_l = 1) \;+\; (1 - \pi_l) \, v_l(r_l), \quad r_l = 1, 2, \ldots, m_l. \qquad (1)$$

Here, $\pi_l = P(U_l = 1)$ and the distribution under uncertainty $v_l(r_l) = P(R_l = r_l \mid U_l = 0)$ is the discrete Uniform distribution over $[1, m_l]$, as considered by D'Elia and Piccolo (2005) and Tutz et al. (2016). The Uniform distribution can be replaced with several alternatives, as illustrated in Section 4.1 and Appendix B. The feeling distributions $P(R_l = r_l \mid U_l = 1)$, with $r_l = 1, 2, \ldots, m_l$ and $l = 1, 2$, can be modelled by the (shifted) Binomial distribution as in the CUB approach (D'Elia and Piccolo, 2005) or by a general ordinal response model as in Tutz et al. (2016).

To specify the joint distribution of the two responses, it is reasonable to assume that R_1 and R_2 are independent whenever $U_1 \cdot U_2 = 0$. This is equivalently expressed by the conditions:

A3. $R_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp R_2 \mid U_1 = 0, U_2 = 0$; $R_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp R_2 \mid U_1 = 0, U_2 = 1$; $R_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp R_2 \mid U_1 = 1, U_2 = 0$.

If $\pi_{ij} = P(U_1 = i, U_2 = j)$, $i = 0, 1$, $j = 0, 1$, are the joint probabilities of the latent variables, assumptions $A1 - A3$ imply that the joint distribution of (R_1, R_2) is a mixture of four conditional distributions

$$\begin{aligned} P(R_1 = r_1, R_2 = r_2) \;=\; & \pi_{00} \, v_1(r_1) \, v_2(r_2) \\ & + \pi_{01} \, v_1(r_1) \, P(R_2 = r_2 \mid U_2 = 1) \\ & + \pi_{10} \, P(R_1 = r_1 \mid U_1 = 1) \, v_2(r_2) \\ & + \pi_{11} \, P(R_1 = r_1, R_2 = r_2 \mid U_1 = 1, U_2 = 1). \end{aligned} \qquad (2)$$

The mixture weights are the probabilities that both the answers are given according to feeling (π_{11}), both conforming to uncertainty (π_{00}) or one with uncertainty and the other one with feeling (π_{01} and π_{10}). According to A1, the marginal distributions of the two responses in the last component of (2) are the same as the feeling distributions $P(R_1 = r_1 \mid U_1 = 1)$ and $P(R_2 = r_2 \mid U_2 = 1)$ involved in the second and third components.

3.1 A parameterization for the distribution of (R_1, R_2)

In order to derive a simple parametric expression for $\pi_l = P(U_l = 1)$, $l = 1, 2$, involved in the marginal probabilities of R_l given in (1), two marginal logits and a log odds ratio are used for parameterizing π_{ij}, $i = 0, 1$, $j = 0, 1$.

The vectors $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\{R_1, U_1\}}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\{R_2, U_2\}}$, including $(m_1 - 1)$ and $(m_2 - 1)$ logits (local, global, continuation, reverse continuation) are used to parameterize the m_1 probabilities $P(R_1 = r_1 \mid U_1 = 1) = P(R_1 = r_1 \mid U_1 = 1, U_2 = 0) = P(R_1 = r_1 \mid$

$U_1 = 1, U_2 = 1)$, and the m_2 probabilities $P(R_2 = r_2 \mid U_2 = 1) = P(R_2 = r_2 \mid U_1 = 0, U_2 = 1) = P(R_2 = r_2 \mid U_1 = 1, U_2 = 1)$, respectively. The vectors of logits, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\{R_1,U_1\}}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\{R_2,U_2\}}$, together with the $(m_1 - 1)(m_2 - 1)$ log odds ratios (local, global, continuation, reverse continuation) of the vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}$ parameterize the joint distribution $P(R_1 = r_1, R_2 = r_2 \mid U_1 = 1, U_2 = 1)$.

This parameterization includes $m_1 m_2 - 1 + 3$ parameters so that identifiability constraints are necessary. For instance, under the constraint of uniform association $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}} = \eta_{12}\mathbf{1}$, the number of parameters $m_1 + m_2 + 2$ does not exceed $m_1 m_2 - 1$ and the necessary condition for identifiability is satisfied. The presence of covariates may also serve this need. For instance, given a set of discrete covariates defining H strata, the vectors of logits $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}$, and of log odds ratios $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}$ are defined for every stratum h, with $h = 1, 2, \ldots, H$. Heterogeneity can be modelled through

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}} = \boldsymbol{X}_{1h}\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \qquad \boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}} = \boldsymbol{X}_{2h}\boldsymbol{\beta}_2, \qquad \boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}} = \boldsymbol{X}_{12h}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{12},$$

where the entries of the matrices $\mathbf{X}_{1h}$, $\mathbf{X}_{2h}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{12h}$ are functions of the covariates. To solve the identifiability issue, one can impose constraints on the parameters of the above linear models. For example, given a covariate with H categories, if $\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(i_1)$, $\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(i_2)$ and $\eta_h^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}(i_1, i_2)$, $i_1 = 1, 2, \ldots, m_1 - 1, i_2 = 1, 2, \ldots, m_2 - 1, h = 1, 2, \ldots, H$ denote the marginal logits and log odds ratios, we can consider the proportional logit models

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(i_1) &= \beta_1(i_1) + \beta_{1h}, \qquad h = 1, 2, \ldots, H, \\
\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(i_2) &= \beta_2(i_2) + \beta_{2h}, \qquad h = 1, 2, \ldots, H, \\
\beta_{11} &= \beta_{21} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

together with the hypothesis of homogeneous association $\eta_h^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}(i_1, i_2) = \beta_{12}(i_1, i_2)$, $i_1 = 1, 2, \ldots, m_1 - 1$, $i_2 = 1, 2, \ldots, m_2 - 1$, $h = 1, 2, \ldots, H$ (Kateri, 2014). For this model, the number of parameters $(m_1 m_2 - 1) + 2(H - 1) + 3$ is less than $H(m_1 m_2 - 1)$, the number of independent observable frequencies, so that the necessary condition for identifiability is always satisfied.

4 A hierarchical marginal model with latent uncertainty components

In this section we introduce a class of Hierarchical Marginal Models with Latent Uncertainty (HMMLU) that generalizes the model of Section 3 to the case of more than two observable variables. Given v ordinal variables R_i, with categories $1, 2, \ldots, m_i$,

$i = 1, 2, \ldots, v$, the configuration $\boldsymbol{r} = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_v)$ is one of the $m = \prod_{i=1}^{v} m_i$ realizations of the ordinal variables. We model uncertainty by assuming that each respondent belongs to one among 2^v latent classes defined by v latent dichotomous random variables $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_v$.

A realization of the latent variables is called *uncertainty configuration* and is described by a binary string $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_v)$ of length v where a 0 in the i^{th} position stands for an uncertain behavior in answering the i^{th} question. According to the model we are going to present, the joint distribution of the observable variables, is a mixture of 2^v components corresponding to the uncertainty configurations $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_v)$.

Given the set of indices $\nu = \{1, 2, \ldots, v\}$, $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i : i \in \nu\}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i : i \in \nu\}$ denote the set of observable and latent variables, respectively. For every $\mathcal{S} \subset \nu$, we can specify the subsets $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{S} = \{R_i : i \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{S} = \{U_i : i \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Specifically, for every uncertainty configuration $\boldsymbol{u}$ we define the sub-set of indices $\nu(\boldsymbol{u}) = \{i : u_i = 0, i \in \nu\}$ and the sub-set of observable variables $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})}$.

4.1 The assumptions of the model

To characterize the feeling-uncertainty attitude in giving answers, we make the following assumptions that generalize the ones of Section 3 to the case of v responses, with $v \geq 2$,

B1. *Specific latent variables*

for every $\mathcal{S} \subset \nu$,

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{S} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{S};$$

B2. *Uncertainty distributions*

for every $i \in \nu$, given $U_i = 0$, R_i has a Uniform distribution;

B3. *Independences due to uncertainty*

for every uncertainty configuration $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, ..., u_v)$ and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \nu(\boldsymbol{u})$,

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{S} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{S} \mid U_i = u_i, \quad i \in \nu;$$

B4. *Composition property*

for every $\mathcal{S} \subset \nu$, $\mathcal{T} \subset \nu$,

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{S} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{U} \text{ is equivalent to } \mathcal{R}_i \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{R}_j \mid \mathcal{U} \text{ for every } i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{T};$$

B5. *Uniform association*

given $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_v)$, the bivariate distributions of the responses $R_i, R_j \notin \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})}$ satisfy a hypothesis of uniform association, i.e. equal local (global, continuation or reverse continuation) odds ratios.

With respect to the assumptions in Section 3, B1 generalizes A1 and B2 is assumption A2. B1 implies that every subset $\mathcal{S}$ of observed variables depends on its corresponding subset of latent variables. Such an assumption is realistic in many applications and in our approach it is of crucial relevance for the identifiability of the model. In assumption B2, the underlying idea that an uncertain interviewee responds at random by assigning equal probability to every category in the scale is often unrealistic. Respondents sometimes tend to use only a small number of the available rating scale options, or to endorse the middle categories regardless of the content (respondents may refrain from using extreme values of the scale, see Kulas and Stachowski, 2009) or to focus exclusively on the extreme categories (Cox, 1980). Several other alternatives of the Uniform distributions, useful in modelling uncertain responses, have been introduced by Gottard et al. (2016) who also discussed their relevance in modelling different uncertain behaviors (resoluteness in the extremes, acquiescence response style, response contraction bias, spike or *shelter* responses). Motivated by these arguments, a more general approach, where uncertain responses are modelled by a probability function that depends on a shape parameter, is described in Appendix B. This generalization can take into account different *response styles* (Baumgartner and Steenkamp, 2001) in the process of scoring and it is also convenient as it fits easily in the framework of the marginal parameterizations used in Section 4.2. In general, for all the distributions, described in Appendix B, high values of the shape parameters correspond to the case where uncertainty is focused on middle categories, while low values coincide with uncertainty focused on extreme categories.

Assumption B3 generalizes A3, and, applying the contraction property of conditional independence, it results equivalent to the two statements

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \mid U_i = u_i, \qquad i \in \mathcal{V}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})} \mid U_i = u_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}$$

for every uncertainty configuration $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})$. In particular, the first statement implies that, conditionally on $\boldsymbol{u}$, the joint probability function of the variables in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})}$ factorizes in the product of the marginal probability functions, which are Uniform probabilities according to B2. The second statement shows that, conditionally on $\boldsymbol{u}$, the variables in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{u})}$, describing uncertain responses, are independent of the remaining observed variables.

Assumption B4 is the composition property of conditional independence (Sadeghi and Lauritzen, 2014) and is equivalent to the condition that all the Glonek-McCullagh interactions (Glonek and McCullagh, 1995) of order higher than 2 are null in the

joint distribution of the responses given the latent variables. In Section 4.2 the advantage of this assumption will be clarified.

Condition B5 relaxes the usual hypothesis of independence given the latent variables and can be also substituted by less stringent conditions in presence of covariates, such as, for instance, the hypothesis of homogeneous association. Essentially, restrictions B4 and B5 are useful for the identifiability of the model.

Note that we did not make any assumptions on the distributions of the latent variables. However, the latent variables may be supposed to be independent or to satisfy a set of conditional independences (see, among others, Lupparelli et al., 2009).

4.2 A marginal parameterization

The joint distribution of the observed and latent variables is parameterized through a marginal model (Bergsma and Rudas, 2002; Bartolucci et al., 2007). Under this class of models, assumptions B1-B5 are equivalent to constraining certain parameters to zero. The same restrictions under the log-linear parameterization would correspond to nonlinear constraints on the parameters. Moreover, the use of marginal models greatly simplifies the introduction of the covariate effects, the maximum likelihood estimation issues and the interpretation of the results in applying HMMLU models to data.

When the respondents are grouped into H strata, corresponding to distinct configurations of some discrete observable covariates, we call $\boldsymbol{p}_h$ the vector of the joint probabilities $p(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{u}, h)$ of the configurations $\boldsymbol{r}$ of the observable variables and the configurations $\boldsymbol{u}$ of the latent ones in the h^{th} stratum, $h = 1, 2, \ldots, H$. These probabilities are arranged in the vector $\boldsymbol{p}_h$ in lexicographic order by letting the observable configurations to change faster than the latent ones.

A marginal parameterization of $\boldsymbol{p}_h$ in terms of a vector of generalized marginal interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$ is defined by the one-to-one mapping $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h = \boldsymbol{C} \ln \boldsymbol{M} \boldsymbol{p}_h$. Here $\boldsymbol{C}$ is a matrix of row contrasts and $\boldsymbol{M}$ a matrix of 0 and 1 values to determine the marginal probabilities of interest (Bartolucci et al., 2007). Specifically, the marginal interactions of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$ are contrasts of logarithms of sums of probabilities in $\boldsymbol{p}_h$ (logits, log odds ratios, of any type, and contrasts of them).

For every non-empty subset $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{U}$, let $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\mathcal{I}}$ be the sub-vector of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$ of the generalized interactions involving only variables in the set $\mathcal{I}$. In the proposed parameterization, these interactions are defined within the family of marginal sets $\{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\} \cup \{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \mathcal{U} : \emptyset \subset \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$ according to the properties of hierarchy and completeness that assure the smoothness of the parameterization (Bergsma and

Rudas, 2002). In particular, the vectors of interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, are defined in the marginal sets $\{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$ and parameterize the vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}_h = (\boldsymbol{I}_{2^v} \otimes \mathbf{1}'_m)\boldsymbol{p}_h$ of the joint probabilities of the latent variables, while the interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathcal{I} \in \{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} : \emptyset \subset \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$, defined in the marginal sets $\{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \mathcal{U} : \emptyset \subset \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$, parameterize the vector $\text{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_h \otimes \mathbf{1}_m)^{-1}\boldsymbol{p}_h$ of the probabilities of the responses given the latent variables.

The resulting model for the joint distribution of the observable responses $\mathcal{R}$, which is a mixture with 2^v components, is clearly not identifiable without the restrictions on the parameters due to the assumptions B0-B5.

We list now the interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathcal{I} \in \{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \mathcal{U} : \emptyset \subset \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$ that are null according to B1-B5. Firstly, B4 implies that all the interactions defined in the marginal sets $\{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \mathcal{U} : \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$ are null if they involve more than two observable variables. Moreover, under B1, the interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $\mathcal{I} = \{R_i\} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} \nsubseteq \{U_i\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{R_i, R_j\} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} \nsubseteq \{U_i, U_j\}$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, v$ are equal to zero. According to B2, the vector $\eta_h^{\{R_i\}}$ is null as it contains logits defined on the Uniform marginal probabilities of R_i, given $U_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, v$. Finally, the parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $\mathcal{I} = \{R_i, R_j\} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} \subset \{U_i, U_j\}$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, v$, are null because of B3.

The remaining non null marginal interactions are defined in marginal sets $\{R_i\} \cup \mathcal{U}$ and $\{R_i, R_j\} \cup \mathcal{U}$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, v$, involving the whole set of latent variables. However, assumptions B1, B2 and B3 ensure that the non null interactions are the vectors of logits $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_i, U_i\}}$, calculated on the marginal distributions of R_i given $U_i = 1$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, v$, and the vectors of log odds ratios $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_i, R_j, U_i, U_j\}}$ defined on the bivariate distributions of R_i, R_j given $U_i = U_j = 1$ $(i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, v)$. Note that such log odds ratios are restricted by assumption B5 to be equal.

Example 1 *In the simple case of two binary responses R_1, R_2 with two binary latent U_1, U_2 described in Section 3, the marginal sets of $\{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$ involving the latent components are $\{U_1\}$, $\{U_2\}$, $\{U_1, U_2\}$, and the sets of $\{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \mathcal{U} : \emptyset \subset \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$, $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2\}$, for the responses together with all the latent variables are $\{R_1, U_1, U_2\}, \{R_2, U_1, U_2\}, \{R_1, R_2, U_1, U_2\}$. The non null interactions are the logits and the log odds ratios described in Section 3.1.*

Finally the interactions defined in the marginal sets of the latent variables $\{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}$ can be constrained according to conditional independence hypotheses on the joint distributions of the latent components.

We can write this model in a compact form specifying that every vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$, for each strata $h = 1, 2, \ldots, H$, satisfies the linear model $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h = \boldsymbol{X}_h\boldsymbol{\beta}$, that imposes the constraints due to assumptions B1-B5 and accounts for the dependence on some categorical covariates whose configurations determine each strata h.

5 ML estimators

The model of Section 4 is related to the extended latent class model introduced by Forcina (2008). This result is here used to deal with maximum likelihood (ML) estimation techniques (analytical details are reported in Appendix A).

Let $\boldsymbol{n}_h$ denote the observed joint frequencies of the responses in the h^{th} stratum of size n_h and $n = \sum_{h=1}^{H} n_h$ the total sample size. The saturated log-linear model for the vector $\boldsymbol{p}_h$ of the joint probabilities of the v latent variables and the v observable responses in the h^{th} stratum is denoted by

$$\boldsymbol{p}_h = \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{\theta}_h)}{\mathbf{1}' \exp(\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{\theta}_h)},$$

where $\boldsymbol{Z}$ is the design matrix of the log-linear model. As shown by Bartolucci et al. (2007), the transformation from the log-linear parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_h$ to the generalized interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h = \boldsymbol{C} \ln \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{p}_h$ is a diffeomorphism.

The saturated log-linear model for the vector $\boldsymbol{q}_h$ of the joint probabilities of the responses in the h^{th} stratum is denoted by

$$\boldsymbol{q}_h = \boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{p}_h = \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_h)}{\mathbf{1}' \exp(\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_h)},$$

where $\boldsymbol{L}$ is the marginalization matrix with respect to the latent variables and $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the design matrix of the log-linear model. Note that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_h = \boldsymbol{H} \ln (\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{p}_h)$ is a vector of contrasts of logarithms of the elements of $\boldsymbol{q}_h$, with $\boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{I}_{m-1}$.

We now exploit the previous results that define $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_h$ as function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_h$ as function of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$ which is in turn a function of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

From Bartolucci et al. (2007), we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{R}_h = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_h'} = \left(\boldsymbol{C} \operatorname{Diag}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{p}_h)\, \boldsymbol{M}\, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_h \boldsymbol{Z}\right)^{-1},$$

with $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_h = \operatorname{Diag}(\boldsymbol{p}_h) - \boldsymbol{p}_h \boldsymbol{p}_h'$. Consequently, by the chain rule of matrix differential calculus (Magnus and Neudecker, 2007), we get

$$\boldsymbol{D}_h = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} = \boldsymbol{Q}_h \boldsymbol{R}_h \boldsymbol{X}_h,$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_h = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_h'} = \boldsymbol{H} \operatorname{Diag}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{q}_h)\, \boldsymbol{L}\, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_h \boldsymbol{Z}.$$

The vector of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ that parameterizes $\boldsymbol{q}_h$ is locally identifiable if and only if the matrix $\boldsymbol{D}$, obtained by row-binding the matrices $\boldsymbol{D}_h$, is of full column rank for every $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ (Forcina, 2008). It also follows that

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} = \left(\operatorname{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}_h) - \boldsymbol{q}_h \boldsymbol{q}_h'\right)\, \boldsymbol{W}\, \boldsymbol{D}_h,$$

which is the main result needed for calculating the Fisher matrix.

Under multinomial sampling within every stratum, the log-likelihood function is

$$L_n = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \boldsymbol{n}_h' \ln(\boldsymbol{q}_h)$$

and the row vector of the score functions is

$$\boldsymbol{S}_n = \sum_{h=1}^{H} (\boldsymbol{n}_h - n_h \boldsymbol{q}_h)' \, \boldsymbol{W} \, \boldsymbol{D}_h.$$

From the previous results, the averaged Fisher matrix easily follows

$$\boldsymbol{F}_n = \tfrac{1}{n} E(\boldsymbol{S}_n' \boldsymbol{S}_n) = \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \boldsymbol{D}_h' \boldsymbol{W}' \left(n_h \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}_h) - n_h \boldsymbol{q}_h \boldsymbol{q}_h' \right) \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{D}_h.$$

If $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{n_h}{n} = \omega_h > 0, \; h = 1, 2, \ldots, H$, then

$$\boldsymbol{F} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \boldsymbol{F}_n = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \omega_h \boldsymbol{D}_h' \boldsymbol{W}' \left(\mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}_h) - \boldsymbol{q}_h \boldsymbol{q}_h' \right) \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{D}_h.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{W}'(\omega_h \, \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}_h) - \omega_h \boldsymbol{q}_h \boldsymbol{q}_h') \boldsymbol{W}$ is non singular, $\boldsymbol{F}$ is non singular too if and only if $\boldsymbol{D}$ is of full column rank.

Henceforth, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ will denote the vector of the true parameters and $\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{\pi}$ will be computed at this value. From the standard MLE theory, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$ has an asymptotic Normal distribution with null expected value and variance matrix $\frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1}$.

Let the vector of marginal interactions $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and the model matrix $\boldsymbol{X}$ be obtained by row-binding $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_h$, respectively. So, from $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$, we deduce that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is asymptotically Normal distributed with null expected value and variance $\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}} = \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{X}'$.

Let $\boldsymbol{Z}_1 = \boldsymbol{I}_H \otimes \boldsymbol{1}_m$ be the *population matrix* (Lang, 2004, 2005) that determines the strata, $\boldsymbol{q} = \mathrm{vec}[\boldsymbol{q}_1, \boldsymbol{q}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_H]$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}) - \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}) \boldsymbol{Z}_1 \boldsymbol{Z}_1' \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q})$.

From $\dfrac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\boldsymbol{I}_H \otimes \boldsymbol{W}) \boldsymbol{D}$, it results that

$$\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}}} = \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\boldsymbol{I}_H \otimes \boldsymbol{W}) \boldsymbol{D} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{D}' (\boldsymbol{I}_H \otimes \boldsymbol{W}') \boldsymbol{\Omega}$$

is the variance of the asymptotic Normal distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}} - \boldsymbol{q}$.

Finally, if $\boldsymbol{n}$ is obtained by row-binding $\frac{\boldsymbol{n}_h}{n_h}$ and $\boldsymbol{m}$ by row-binding $\frac{\boldsymbol{q}_h}{\omega_h}$, it follows that the vector of residuals $\boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{n} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{q}}$ is asymptotically Normal distributed with variance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{e}} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{m}) - \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{m}) \, \boldsymbol{Z}_1 \boldsymbol{Z}_1' \, \mathrm{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}) \right) - \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}}}.$$

When implementing inferential tools (confidence intervals, residual analysis, etc), the previous variance matrices can be estimated by replacing the parameters with their ML estimates and the ω_h with $\frac{n_h}{n}$.

An R-function that maximizes the log-likelihood function $L_n = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \boldsymbol{n}_h' \ln(\boldsymbol{q}_h)$ and computes the ML estimates with their estimated standard errors is available from the authors. The function relies on the package hmmm (Colombi et al., 2014).

6 A simulation study

To illustrate the performance of the proposed model and the consequences of ignoring uncertainty in the responses, we conducted a Monte Carlo simulation study from three different scenarios. For each scenario, we generated 100 random samples from the distribution proposed in Section 3. On each sample, we fitted the correct model using the parameterization presented in Section 3. Moreover, we fitted the marginal model that ignores the existence of uncertainty in responding, wrongly assuming $\pi_{11} = 1$.

In each scenario, it is $m_l = 4$, $\pi_l = P(U_l = 1) = 0.7$ for $l = 1, 2$, and no covariate is included. The uncertainty distribution is assumed Uniform. The remaining parameter settings, specific for the three scenarios, are as follows:
Scenario A: We set the log odds ratio for the latent variables U_1 and U_2 at 2. The marginal distribution of $R_l \mid U_l = 1$ is $(0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4)$ for $l = 1, 2$. The association for the observed variables is modelled with all the local log odds ratios $\eta^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}(i_1, i_2) = \eta^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}} = 3$, for $i_1, i_2 = 1, 2, 3$.
Scenario B: The setup is similar to Scenario A except that U_1 and U_2 are independent and the marginal distribution of $R_2 \mid U_2 = 1$ is $(0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1)$.
Scenario C: The same as in Scenario B, but the marginal distribution of $R_1 \mid U_1 = 1$ is $(0.4, 0.1, 0.1, 0.4)$ and of $R_2 \mid U_2 = 1$ is $(0.1, 0.4, 0.4, 0.1)$.

The Monte Carlo experiment was repeated for sample size $n = 1\,000$ and $n = 10\,000$. Summaries of the simulation results are reported in Tables 2 and 3. In these tables, the local logits and log odds ratios parameters corresponding to the three scenarios are reported in the lines labelled as *True*. As can be seen along the tables, the proposed estimation procedure is able to capture quite well the model parameters concerning the rating of the two items in the uncertainty-free component ($U_1 = U_2 = 1$). On the other hand, the estimates for the model parameters obtained ignoring uncertainty, well illustrate the consequences of model misspecification. These consequences are better detectable in Figure 1 that presents the box plots for the Monte Carlo errors under the proposal models (white) and ignoring uncertainty (coloured).

Table 2: Monte Carlo averages and standard deviations of parameter estimates under the correct model specification and ignoring the uncertainty component, with sample size $n = 1\,000$

	$\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(1)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(2)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(3)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(1)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(2)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(3)$	$\eta^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}$	$\eta^{\{U_1\}}$	$\eta^{\{U_2\}}$	$\eta^{\{U_1,U_2\}}$
					Scenario A					
True	0.69	0.41	0.29	0.69	0.41	0.29	3.00	0.85	0.85	2.00
Correct model specification										
MC Average	0.74	0.40	0.29	0.72	0.41	0.29	3.09	0.86	0.88	2.19
MC sd	0.20	0.13	0.09	0.20	0.14	0.11	0.27	0.31	0.35	1.60
Ignoring uncertainty										
MC Average	0.40	0.28	0.22	0.40	0.28	0.22	0.50			
MC sd	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.04			
					Scenario B					
True	0.69	0.41	0.29	-0.29	-0.41	-0.69	3.00	0.85	0.85	0.00
Correct model specification										
MC Average	0.72	0.39	0.30	-0.30	-0.40	-0.68	2.59	0.85	0.90	0.34
MC sd	0.21	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.20	0.28	0.32	0.37	1.55
Ignoring uncertainty										
MC Average	0.40	0.27	0.23	-0.23	-0.28	-0.38	0.34			
MC sd	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.04			
					Scenario C					
True	-1.39	-0.00	1.39	1.39	0.00	-1.39	3.00	0.85	0.85	0.00
Correct model specification										
MC Average	-1.37	0.01	1.37	1.43	0.01	-1.40	3.19	0.95	0.85	0.16
MC sd	0.26	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.10	0.18	0.97	0.41	0.29	1.35
Ignoring uncertainty										
MC Average	-0.89	0.00	0.89	0.91	0.00	-0.89	0.38			
MC sd	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.04			

Table 3: Monte Carlo averages and standard deviations of parameter estimates under the correct model specification and ignoring the uncertainty component, with sample size $n = 10\,000$

	$\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(1)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(2)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_1,U_1\}}(3)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(1)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(2)$	$\eta_h^{\{R_2,U_2\}}(3)$	$\eta^{\{R_1,R_2,U_1,U_2\}}$	$\eta^{\{U_1\}}$	$\eta^{\{U_2\}}$	$\eta^{\{U_1,U_2\}}$
					Scenario A					
True	0.69	0.41	0.29	0.69	0.41	0.29	3.00	0.85	0.85	2.00
Correct model specification										
MC Average	0.69	0.40	0.29	0.69	0.40	0.29	3.00	0.88	0.88	1.83
MC sd	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.52
Ignoring uncertainty										
MC Average	0.39	0.28	0.22	0.40	0.28	0.22	0.49			
MC sd	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.01			
					Scenario B					
True	0.69	0.41	0.29	-0.29	-0.41	-0.69	3.00	0.85	0.85	0.00
Correct model specification										
MC Average	0.69	0.41	0.29	-0.28	-0.40	-0.70	2.94	0.84	0.85	0.08
MC sd	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.17	0.11	0.10	0.43
Ignoring uncertainty										
MC Average	0.39	0.28	0.22	-0.22	-0.28	-0.40	0.34			
MC sd	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.01			
					Scenario C					
True	-1.39	-0.00	1.39	1.39	0.00	-1.39	3.00	0.85	0.85	0.00
Correct model specification										
MC Average	-1.39	-0.00	1.39	1.39	-0.00	-1.40	3.12	0.88	0.84	-0.00
MC sd	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.63	0.17	0.09	0.32
Ignoring uncertainty										
MC Average	-0.90	-0.00	0.90	0.90	-0.00	-0.90	0.37			
MC sd	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01			



Figure 1: Box plot of Monte Carlo errors for marginal logit (first column) and log odds ratio (second column), including (white) and ignoring (coloured) uncertainty, and latent variable parameters (third column) with $n = 10\,000$

Estimates from the model ignoring uncertainty differ substantially from the true values and underestimate or overestimate the true parameters. As a matter of fact, ignoring uncertainty corresponds to estimating logits and log odds ratios of the mixture of four components (2), when actually we are interested in the parameters of the fourth component of this mixture. In particular, in Scenario A the local logits, all positive, are underestimated. On the contrary, in Scenario B the negative local logits of $R_2 \mid U_2 = 1$ are overestimated. A similar pattern can be detected in Scenario C for the positive and negative logits of the probability functions $(0.4, 0.1, 0.1, 0.4)$ and $(0.1, 0.4, 0.4, 0.1)$. This is explained by the fact that in the marginal mixtures (1), the logits shrink in absolute values because of the Uniform component. Analogously, in all the considered scenarios, the positive uniform association in the fourth component of the mixture (2) is underestimated if uncertainty is not taken into account.

7 Application to EWCS data

In this section, the proposed model is applied to the EWCS data form Eurofound, presented in Section 2 to give an idea of the usefulness of the HMMLU models. We fitted several models specified via local logits and log odds ratios, to investigate the effects of covariates through additive proportional logit models, and different hypotheses on the association on both the observed and the latent variables. The Local Reshaped Parabolic distribution (see Appendix B) has been used instead of the Uniform distribution for the responses in case of uncertainty on the three Eurofound questions. Table 4 summarizes the results of some of these models.

According to the likelihood ratio test (LRT), model $\mathcal{M}_4$ shows the best fit. This model assumes independence among the uncertainty components U_l, $l = 1, 2, 3$, and homogeneous uniform association (see Kateri, 2014, Section 6.7.2) for the responses when $U_l = 1$, $l = 1, 2, 3$. The estimated parameters of model $\mathcal{M}_4$, referring to the observed and latent variables, are reported in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. Estimates in Table 5 confirm that taking into account the uncertainty in the answers, workers' perceptions on the three aspects of their job vary according to *Gender* and *Country* in a similar way. In fact, the logits for all the responses decrease for women and increase for Southern European workers, as the MLEs of the βs for *Gender* (*Country*) are negative (positive). The corresponding probabilities are illustrated in Figure 2. In quite all the four covariate strata (*Male-North, Female-North, Male-South, Female-South*) the distribution of the answers for the *Wellpaid* question is left skewed. Workers from the South of EU appear more satisfied of their salary, whereas women seem less gratified. The distributions in all the strata for *Losejob*,

Table 4: Log-likelihood values (ℓ) and likelihood ratio test (LRT) for the fitted models on EWCS data according to the hypotheses on covariate effects and association for observed and latent variables. All models are additive proportional logit models and Uncertainty has Local Reshaped Parabolic distribution

Models	*Hypotheses on obs. responses*	*Hypotheses on latent var.*	ℓ	*n. par.*	*LRT*	*p-value*
$\mathcal{M}_1$	Gender, Country *homogeneous*	Gender, Country *no indep.*	-9911.31	39		
$\mathcal{M}_2$	Gender, Country *hom. uniform ass.*	Gender, Country *no indep.*	-9916.38	30	$\mathcal{M}_2$ vs $\mathcal{M}_1$	0.3504
$\mathcal{M}_3$	Gender, Country *indep.*	Gender, Country *no indep.*	-10168.66	27	$\mathcal{M}_3$ vs $\mathcal{M}_2$	0.0000
$\mathcal{M}_4$	Gender, Country *hom. uniform ass.*	Gender, Country *indep.*	-9918.55	27	$\mathcal{M}_4$ vs $\mathcal{M}_2$	0.2614
$\mathcal{M}_5$	Gender, Country *hom. uniform ass.*	No covariates *indep.*	-9928.85	21	$\mathcal{M}_5$ vs $\mathcal{M}_4$	0.0021
$\mathcal{M}_6$	No covariates *hom. uniform ass.*	Gender, Country *indep.*	-10052.78	21	$\mathcal{M}_6$ vs $\mathcal{M}_4$	0.0000

instead, are right skewed, with high frequency of people not worried about their job stability. Finally, in the fitted distribution for the opinion on *Career* opportunities, the three categories are almost equiprobable. Here, women tend to disagree more than men, given the *Country*, while Southern workers mainly agree with the idea of having good career perspectives, given the *Gender*.

The estimated log odds ratios in the last row of Table 5 suggest that people, who answered accurately, provide negatively associated responses when one of them is referred to the *Losejob* statement, while the responses to the items *Wellpaid* and *Career* are positively associated. This result seems reasonable since workers, who are worried about the loss of their job and thus mainly select the last categories (*n. agree n. disagree, agree*) for the item *Losejob*, probably don't meet good opportunities in their career or satisfaction in the remuneration. On the contrary, workers with unfair pay probably are also discouraged about the future advancements. Consequently, the agreements for *Wellpaid* and *Career* statements are concordant. Note that a key aspect of the HMMLU model is that it allows to describe the association among answers without the impact of the uncertainty. In this example, the data are coherent with a homogeneous uniform association among answers of certain respondents, whereas ignoring the uncertainty the association would be unrestricted.

Table 5: Maximum likelihood estimates (MLE), standard errors (s.e.) and p-values of the parameters of model $\mathcal{M}_4$ for the observed variables $R_1 = Losejob$, $R_2 = Wellpaid$, $R_3 = Career$. Additive proportional logit models are assumed with local specification for logits and log odds ratios

	Losejob			*Wellpaid*			*Career*		
Parameters	MLE	s.e.	p-value	MLE	s.e.	p-value	MLE	s.e.	p-value
$\eta^{\{R_i,U_i\}}(1)$	-2.1140	0.2592	0.0000	0.2673	0.0546	0.0000	-0.2616	0.1387	0.0593
$\eta^{\{R_i,U_i\}}(2)$	0.5055	0.2226	0.0232	0.1333	0.0433	0.0021	-0.0752	0.1284	0.5582
β_i^G	-0.0737	0.0258	0.0043	-0.2282	0.0269	0.0000	-0.1186	0.0276	0.0000
β_i^C	0.1035	0.0364	0.0045	0.5992	0.0331	0.0000	0.3624	0.0328	0.0000
	Losejob, Wellpaid			*Losejob, Career*			*Wellpaid, Career*		
$\eta^{\{R_i,R_j,U_i,U_j\}}$	-0.3865	0.0434	0.0000	-0.3442	0.0459	0.0000	1.1372	0.1030	0.0000

Table 6: Maximum likelihood estimates (MLE), standard errors (s.e.) and p-values of the parameters of model $\mathcal{M}_4$ for the latent variables

	U_1			U_2			U_3		
Parameters	MLE	s.e.	p-value	MLE	s.e.	p-value	MLE	s.e.	p-value
$\eta^{\{U_i\}}$	2.4470	0.8216	0.0029	3.1895	0.3766	0.0000	1.2927	0.4017	0.0013
β_i^G	0.3515	0.1799	0.0506	-0.9284	0.1633	0.0000	-0.0867	0.1065	0.4155
β_i^C	0.4365	0.2443	0.0741	-1.1159	0.2970	0.0002	0.1126	0.1171	0.3364

The parameter estimates for the latent variables U_l, $l = 1, 2, 3$, reported in Table 6, are consistent with the hypotheses that people tend to be uncertain in expressing their opinion on the three statements independently and heterogeneously according to the covariates. The two subject's covariates have effects, but in the opposite way (opposite signs of MLEs of the βs), on the probability to be not confident in answering questions about the loss of own job and having a good pay. In particular, men from the North of EU appear more unsure when evaluate how plausible is the possibility to lose their job in the next months, while women from the Southern countries of EU are more uncertain in judging adequate their salary. On the contrary, *Gender* and *Country* seem not to discriminate the propensity to answer with uncertainty when the opinion on future career opportunities is asked.

Figure 3 shows the probabilities of being uncertain about the three answers among the four strata of the covariates. It highlights that workers are more likely



Figure 2: Fitted distributions of the responses *Losejob*, *Wellpaid*, *Career* according to the covariate strata (*Male-North, Female-North, Male-South, Female-South*) the respondents belong to

to be uncertain about their career opportunities in general, but most indecision concerns *Wellpaid* for women living in the Southern countries (about 25% of uncertain responses).

Figure 4 shows the distributions (Local Reshaped Parabolic) of the three responses in case of uncertain behaviour. The first distribution referred to *Losejob* is bell-shaped with a tendency to answer the middle category. When unable to quantify their perception, the respondents tend to avoid to use the extreme categories (see Kulas and Stachowski, 2009, among others). On the contrary, the distributions of uncertainty on *Wellpaid* and *Career* are U-shaped showing how uncertain people on their salary or their future prospectives tend to be split in optimistic and pessimistic behaviours.



Figure 3: Probabilities of being uncertain ($U_l = 0$, $l = 1, 2, 3$) in answering the questions *Losejob*, *Wellpaid*, *Career* according to the covariate strata (*Male-North, Female-North, Male-South, Female-South*) the respondents belong to



Figure 4: Plot of the distribution of the responses under uncertainty according to the MLE estimates of the shape parameters $\hat{\phi}_1 = 10.28, \hat{\phi}_2 = -17.36, \hat{\phi}_3 = -14.49$ of Local Reshaped Parabolic distributions

8 Concluding remarks

The proposed mixture model, called Hierarchical Marginal Model with Latent Uncertainty (HMMLU), is able to distinguish two kinds (feeling and uncertainty) of behaviour that people may adopt, even unconsciously, when faced with different rating questions. HMMLU models offer flexibility in specifying the marginal distributions, allow that the uncertain behaviour of the respondents toward some items may affect the uncertainty toward other items and permit to model the association among responses given without uncertainty.

The flexibility of these models is improved when alternative distributions to the Uniform are used in modelling uncertain responses. For this reason, we introduce in Appendix B a class of distributions with a shape parameter that is an interesting alternative to the Uniform choice. As an alternative, one can also adopt one of the distributions provided by Gottard et al. (2016). The problem of selecting the most adequate distribution of uncertainty is still an open problem and deserves an in depth study.

Another issue not considered in this paper, that will be the object of future research, is to test if uncertainty/feeling rules only some or none of the responses. Testing such hypotheses represents a non-standard problem as, under the null hypothesis, some parameters are on the boundary of their parametric space. This problem can be solved along the lines of Colombi and Giordano (2016) who dealt with the problem of testing uncertainty in a different multivariate model.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Alan Agresti for his thoughtful and suggestive comments.

Appendix A: Asymptotic variances

We report some details on the derivation of the asymptotic variances reported in Section 5. From standard results on ML estimators, it is

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{S}_n' + o_p(1) \tag{3}$$

from which it follows that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$ is asymptotically Normal with null expected value and asymptotic variance matrix $\frac{1}{n}\boldsymbol{F}^{-1}$. The expression, given for $\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}$, follows immediately. By (3) and the delta method we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}_h} - \boldsymbol{q}_h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{S}_n' + o_p(1). \tag{4}$$

By (4) the expression of $\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}}}$ is obtained by considering that $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}_h} - \boldsymbol{q}_h)$ has asymptotic variance

$$\boldsymbol{V}_{\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}_h}-\boldsymbol{q}_h)} = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h'}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}. \tag{5}$$

Finally, it is straightforward to see that

$$Cov\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{S}_n, \sqrt{n}\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{n}_h}{n_h} - \boldsymbol{q}_h\right)\right) = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} \boldsymbol{F}^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{q}_h'}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}. \tag{6}$$

Using $\lim_{n\to\infty} \boldsymbol{V}_{\sqrt{n}\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{n}_h}{n_h}-\boldsymbol{q}_h\right)} = \frac{1}{w_h}(\text{Diag}(\boldsymbol{q}_h) - \boldsymbol{q}_h\boldsymbol{q}_h')$ and results in (4), (5) and (6), the expression of $\boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{e}}$ follows.

Appendix B: Reshaped uncertainty distributions

We extend the Uniform and symmetric Parabolic models for uncertainty (Gottard et al., 2016) by introducing a shape parameter.

The global odds $\mu_i = \frac{i}{m-i}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, of a discrete Uniform random variable with support $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ are called Uniform global odds. The discrete Reshaped Uniform random variable has a probability function defined by the powers μ_i^{ϕ}, $\phi > 0$, of the Uniform global odds. The non-negative parameter ϕ is a shape parameter. It turns out that its distribution function is

$$F(i;\phi) = \frac{\mu_i^{\phi}}{1+\mu_i^{\phi}}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1, \qquad F(m;\phi) = 1$$

and that when $\phi = 1$ the discrete Uniform distribution is obtained as a special case. It is possible to prove that this distribution is symmetric with mean value $(m+1)/2$ for any ϕ. If $\phi > 1$ and m is odd there is a single mode at the mean value whereas when $\phi > 1$ and m is even there are two modal values at $m/2$ and $m/2+1$. Moreover, for $\phi \longrightarrow \infty$ the distribution degenerates to the mean value, while for $\phi \longrightarrow 0$ to a distribution with mass of $1/2$ at the extreme categories. The distribution is U-shaped if $\phi < 1$.

If the Reshaped Uniform is used to model uncertainty then for $\phi > 1$ uncertain people tend to prefer middle categories and extreme categories when $\phi < 1$. Similar uncertainty distributions can be obtained by starting from powers of the local odds or of the global odds of the discrete Parabolic probability function

$$p(i) = \frac{6(m+1-i)i}{(m+2)(m+1)m}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$$

with distribution function

$$F(i) = \frac{i(i+1)(3(m+1)-2i-1)}{(m+2)(m+1)m}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m.$$

The powers of the local odds and of the global odds lead to two different Reshaped Parabolic probability functions which will be called Local Reshaped and Global Reshaped, respectively. The Local Reshaped Parabolic distribution family contains, as a special case, the Uniform distribution ($\phi = 0$) and for negative ϕ is U-shaped.

The Global Reshaped Parabolic distribution is defined only for $\phi \geq 0$ and assigns probability 1/2 to the two extreme categories when $\phi = 0$. Like the Reshaped Uniform distributions, both Local and Global Reshaped Parabolic have constant expected value and variance which is a decreasing function of ϕ.

If uncertainty is modelled by the Reshaped Uniform (or Parabolic) distribution and if the shape parameters do not depend on covariates, there are v parameters ϕ_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, v$ to be added to the parameters described in Section 4.2. In this case, the vector of logits of the distribution of R_i, given $U_i = 0$, is $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_i\}} = \phi_i \boldsymbol{g}_i$, where $\boldsymbol{g}_i$ is the vector of the logits of the Uniform (Parabolic) uncertainty distribution (global logits for the Uniform, local or global logits for the Parabolic distribution). Here, the logits defined on the marginal distribution of R_i, given $U_i = 1$, are equal to $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_i\}} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_h^{\{R_i,U_i\}}$.

References

Bartolucci, F., R. Colombi, and A. Forcina (2007). An extended class of marginal link functions for modelling contingency tables by equality and inequality constraints. *Statistica Sinica 17*, 691–711.

Baumgartner, H. and J.-B. E. Steenkamp (2001). Response styles in marketing research: A cross-national investigation. *Journal of Marketing Research 38*(2), 143–156.

Bergsma, W. P. and T. Rudas (2002). Marginal models for categorical data. *Annals of Statistics 30*(1), 140–159.

Colombi, R. and S. Giordano (2016). A class of mixture models for multidimensional ordinal data. *Statistical Modelling 16*(4), 322–340.

Colombi, R., S. Giordano, and M. Cazzaro (2014). hmmm: an R package for hierarchical multinomial marginal models. *Journal of Statistical Software 59*(11), 1–25.

Cox, E. P. (1980). The optimal number of response alternatives for a scale: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research 17*(4), 407–422.

D'Elia, A. and D. Piccolo (2005). A mixture model for preferences data analysis. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 49*(3), 917–934.

Forcina, A. (2008). Identifiability of extended latent class models with individual covariates. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 52*(12), 5263–5268.

Glonek, G. F. and P. McCullagh (1995). Multivariate logistic models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological) 57*(3), 533–546.

Gottard, A., M. Iannario, and D. Piccolo (2016). Varying uncertainty in CUB models. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification 10*(2), 225–244.

Kateri, M. (2014). *Contingency Table Analysis: Methods and Implementation Using R.* Springer.

Kulas, J. T. and A. A. Stachowski (2009). Middle category endorsement in odd-numbered likert response scales: Associated item characteristics, cognitive demands, and preferred meanings. *Journal of Research in Personality 43*(3), 489–493.

Lang, J. B. (2004). Multinomial-Poisson homogeneous models for contingency tables. *Annals of Statistics 32*(1), 340–383.

Lang, J. B. (2005). Homogeneous linear predictor models for contingency tables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 100*(469), 121–134.

Luchini, S. and V. Watson (2013). Uncertainty and framing in a valuation task. *Journal of Economic Psychology 39*, 204–214.

Lupparelli, M., G. M. Marchetti, and W. P. Bergsma (2009). Parameterization and fitting of discrete bi-directed graph models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics 36*(3), 559–576.

Magnus, J. R. and H. Neudecker (2007). *Matrix Differential Calculus with Applications in Statistics and Econometrics. Third edition.* John Wiley & Sons.

Sadeghi, K. and S. Lauritzen (2014). Markov properties for mixed graphs. *Bernoulli 20*(2), 676–696.

Tutz, G., M. Schneider, M. Iannario, and D. Piccolo (2016). Mixture models for ordinal responses to account for uncertainty of choice. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, DOI 10.1007/s11634–016–0247–9.

Yates, J. F., J.-W. Lee, and J. G. Bush (1997). General knowledge overconfidence: Cross-national variations, response style, and "reality". *Organizational behavior and human decision processes 70*(2), 87–94.